

B. REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, Claims 1, 2, and 4 have been amended, and Claim 3 has been cancelled. The amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to this application. Claims 1-2, 4-9, and 12-19 are currently pending.

All issues raised in the final Office Action mailed July 31, 2009 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 and 7-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 7-9

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 2003/0184782, Perkins in view of Shin, U.S. Patent No. 6,351,320 (hereinafter “Shin”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites in part, with emphasis added:

use the configuration data to generate one or more graphical user interface objects that are displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document, wherein the one or more graphical user interface objects correspond to installed options, **and wherein a second graphical user interface object is displayed on the graphical user interface in response to a user selecting a first graphical user interface object and the second graphical user interface satisfying a dependency condition, the dependency condition to be stored in the program logic data.**

Page 4 of the Office Action asserts that Figure 5 and paragraph 35 of Perkins teaches using configuration data to generate one or more graphical user interfaces, but even assuming

arguendo, this is a fair reading of Perkins, Perkins contains no discussion of program logic data that “stores a dependency condition.” Accordingly, Perkins does not teach, and is not even alleged to teach, at least this aspect of Claim 1.

Therefore, the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claim 1. Claims 2-3 and 7-9 are dependant claims that depend on independent claim 1, discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims includes the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Shin, and further in view of Hanson ,U.S. Patent No. 6,148,346 (hereinafter “Hanson”).

Claims 4-6 are dependant claims that depend on independent claim 1, discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims includes the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant

claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Shin, and further in view of US 2003/0184782 (hereinafter “Allen”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Page 8 of the Office Action acknowledges that the combination of Perkins and Shin fails to teach Claim 12, but the Office Action asserts that Allen cures the deficiencies of Perkins and Shin. Allen, however, teaches away from claim 12 by describing a system that operates fundamentally different from and that is incompatible with claim 12. Claim 12 recites “the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second version identification from the printing device . . . [and] compare the first version identification data to the second version identification data.” Paragraph 23 of Allen states “the client device 24 does not synchronously poll the printer web server to determine if a configuration change has been made,” but in contrast to Claim 12, the printer web server initiates a communication with the client device in response to a configuration change. Paragraph 23 of Allen contains no teaching of a printer driver that retrieves and compares as recited in Claim 12, and because in Allen the printer web server

initiates the communication with the client device, adding such a feature would be superfluous.

Therefore, the combination of Allen, Perkins, and Shin does not render obvious claim 12.

For at least all the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 12, and claim 13 which depends from claim 12, are allowable over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 14

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Shin, and further in view of Vidyanand, U.S. Patent No. 6,967,728 (hereinafter “Vidyanand”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 14 depends on independent claim 1, discussed above. Because dependant claim 14 includes the limitations of claim 1 upon which it depends, claim 14 is patentable for at least those reasons claim 1 is patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to claim 14 and allowance of claim 14 is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 14 introduces additional limitations that independently render it patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Hanson. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In regards to

independent Claim 15, page 7 of the Office Action states that “Perkins does not teach a printer driver configured to retrieve bitmap data from a printing device.” The Office Action, however, asserts that Hanson cures the deficiencies of Perkins, stating that “Hanson does teach a printer driver configured to retrieve bitmap data from a printing device” and citing to column 5, lines 13-22 of Hanson. The cited section of Hanson states the following:

FIGS. 3-8 illustrate examples of displayed menus of GUI objects 52 that include printer specific objects 54. Another embodiment, not shown, incorporates the GUI objects 52 into the menus of the application software 32 running on the operating system. For example, a printer options window of the common command windows for Word 6.0 of a printer connected to the host computer system through a standard device driver and a printer connected to the host through the dynamic device driver 42 would be visually the same and may include similar printer options.

The cited portion of Hanson, as well as the rest of Hanson, makes no mention of bitmap data, and more particularly, contains no teaching or suggestion of “retrieve bitmap data from a printing device.” Accordingly, the prior art cited in the Office Action fails to teach or suggest all aspects of Claim 15, and therefore the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claim 15. Claims 16 and 17 depend from Claim 15 and are therefore allowable for at least all the same reasons as Claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 18

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Hanson, and further in view of GB 2,347,766 (hereinafter “Wilson”).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 18 depends on independent claim 15, discussed above. Because dependant claim 18 includes the limitations of claim 15 upon which it depends, claim 18 is patentable for at least those reasons claim 15 is patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to claim 18 and allowance of claim 18 is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 18 introduces additional limitations that independently render it patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 19

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Hanson, and further in view of Vidyanand. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 19 depends on independent claim 15, discussed above. Because dependant claim 18 includes the limitations of claim 15 upon which it depends, claim 19 is patentable for at least those reasons claim 15 is patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to claim 19 and allowance of claim 19 is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 19 introduces additional limitations that independently render it patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: November 2, 2009

/JeffreyRJoseph54204/

Jeffrey R. Joseph

Reg. No. 54,204

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 754-1457
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076